



City of Seattle
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
Land Use Review

JODI J PATTERSON-O'HARE
17479 7TH AVE SW
NORMANDY PARK, WA 98166

Attn:

Re: Project #3028747-LU

Correction Notice #1

Review Type LAND USE
Project Address 601 4TH AVE
SEATTLE, WA 98104
Contact Email JODI@PERMITCNW.COM
SDCI Reviewer Magda Hogness
Reviewer Phone (206) 727-8736
Reviewer Fax
Reviewer Email Magda.Hogness@seattle.gov
Owner
Corrections also apply to Project(s)

Date May 11, 2018
Contact Phone (425) 681-4718

Address Seattle Department of Construction and
Inspections
700 Fifth Ave
Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Applicant Instructions

Please see the attached flyer to learn "[How to Respond to a SDCI Correction Notice](#)".

If the 3-step process outlined in this document is not followed, it is likely that there will be a delay in permit issuance and there is a potential for penalty fees.

Corrections

1. Design Review – Next Steps:

- Schedule a Meeting Before you Resubmit.** Before you re-submit your corrected plans, contact me to schedule a meeting to review your responses to these design corrections/comments. You are responsible for being sufficiently prepared to discuss your design responses to the issues raised in this correction notice.
- Scheduling your Recommendation Meeting.** After you re-submit your corrected plans and have revised the design to fully respond to EDG guidance, a Design Review Recommendation meeting will be scheduled. Your re-submittal should include the following:

- Corrected plans and draft Design Review packet uploaded via the electronic project portal.
- One hard copy of the draft Design Review packet to me directly (delivered to the 19th floor elevator lobby).

Once you have submitted all required materials, please alert me of the re-submittal and I will initiate scheduling the Recommendation meeting at the earliest available date (a minimum of six weeks). It is SDCI's expectation that you will continue to work with SDCI to further develop and refine the design in response to Board and staff reviews. If it is determined that the packet or design has not been responsive to guidance, it may result in postponement of the Recommendation meeting.

2. Circulation and Vehicular Access: At the EDG meeting, *"The Board noted that the success of the recessed vehicular access relies on the design development and recommended carefully studying the proportion of the overhang, relationship to adjacent retail, narrowing the width of the vehicular zone and fine-grained pavement pattern to delineate the pedestrian zone. For the next meeting, the Board requested enlarged sections and a study model of the area. (B3, E1, E2, D6)"*

Provide enlarged elevations, perspectives and sections of this area. After I've received these graphics, I may have additional feedback or corrections.

Project #3028747-LU, Correction Notice #1

3. Pedestrian Circulation *“The Board unanimously agreed that the retail overlook should be avoided as it creates a dead end condition with safety challenges. For this area, the Board recommended studying a pass through space with a wider opening which could act as a secondary route through to the open space and transit stations. Several members of the Board also indicated additional retail could also be a potential solution as it would reinforce the street wall. (B1, B3, C1, C3, D1, D6)”*

Provide an alternate with a pass through space/secondary route for comparison.

4. Street Edges: *“The Board strongly supported the development of the street wall edge along Cherry and the addition of retail to support the heavily used pedestrian route. To avoid the presence of blank concrete walls, the Board recommended stepping the retail frontage and expanding the transparency down to the pedestrian. (B1, C1, C3)”*

The response to add spandrel is noted; provide an alternate study which steps the retail floor plate to improve transparency and strengthen the potential for street level interaction.

5. Location of the Tower on the Site: *“The Board strongly supported the proposed height of the lifted tower overhang as shown on pages 58 and 62 of the packet, as the void maintains a visual connection for the public from Fourth Avenue to Third Avenue. (A1, B1, B3, D1)”*

It appears the lifted tower overhang has been lowered; revise and match the height presented to the DRB.

6. Open Space Concept: *“While the Board supported the design intent to create a series of open spaces allowing for varied experiences, the Board agreed with public comment that additional design development was needed to ensure the open spaces feel welcoming to the public and gave guidance to enhance accessibility and connectivity...The Board supported the effort to create a visual connection between the upper plaza open space provided on site with the City Hall open space as the circular geometry visually joins the spaces together. Related to this open space, the Board was concerned that the circular water feature creates a barrier and recommended refining the height and location to enhance the connection to the street...The Board continued to stress the importance of balancing pedestrian connectivity through the space with the sidewalk circulation. Echoing public comment, the Board recommended incorporating accessible routes through the site and supported adding an elevator to allow for a fully accessible route. (B1, C1, D1, D3)”*

Provide perspectives of the open spaces; explain the detailing and intended character of each open space and address visual access/permeability through the site. While the addition of the elevator to aid accessibility is undoubtedly welcome, study the location of the elevator to avoid obscuring views through the site.

7. Open Space Water feature: *“For the green terraces open space, the Board acknowledged public comment and was concerned with the location and amount of space dedicated to a water feature and recommended sizing the water feature based on the operation and maintenance. The Board also requested additional information on the seasonal design intent, when the water feature is turned off during the winter. (B1, D1, D3)”*

For the water feature, provide additional information on the seasonal design intent.

8. Open Space Circulation: *“In addition to narrowing the water feature, the Board recommended revising the circulation and incorporating additional spaces for seating and pause. While the Board supported the general design approach to shift circulation for specific vistas, the Board observed and stressed the opportunity to enhance the connection between retail frontage and open space, similar to the open space graphic shown on page 34 of the packet. The Board also cautioned against seating areas which appear exclusive for retail users and agreed the open spaces should encourage seating and be welcoming for everyone. (B1, C1, D1, D3)”*

The addition of hardscape along the retail frontage below the tower overhang is noted and appreciated; study ways to strengthen circulation to enhance the connection between these spaces. One potential solution may be to add pedestrian bridges over the water feature.

9. Open Space Transit Shelters: *“The Board continued to recommend integrating the transit station entrances with the open space and encouraged studying options to enhance the stations and surrounding the open space. (B3, C1, D1, D3)”*

Study options to enhance the stations and surrounding the open space; address future transit improvements.

10. Tower Materiality and Form: In the MUP plan set and draft Recommendation packet, provide dimensioned wall section details and plan details, as well as 3D diagrams showing the proposed construction of the exterior facades.

On the large scale elevations, include detailed material descriptions and colors, reflectance and opacity of glazing. Also

dimension the elevations to document the projecting balconies.

11. Pedestrian Level Materiality and Form: *"The Board continued to recommend developing the scale of the architecture adjacent to the open space and recommended exploring the proportion and detailing to establish a human scale and translating the tower detailing down to the pedestrian level. The Board indicated the tower overhang soffit is critical to resolve and recommended thoughtfully exploring the materials and lighting for this element. (A1, B3, B4, C2)"*

Address texture, human scale and quality with material selection. Provide large scale elevations along the street and plaza levels showing the level at grade and at least one or two levels above, as applicable. Articulate the relationship between the different materials and how the detailing strengthens and establishes a human scale.

12. Tower Top Materiality and Form: *"Related to the tower top, the Board agreed with public comment that tower should provide a special contribution to the skyline and may require further refinement to be better integrated with the rest of the design concept. To provide interest to the skyline and reinforce a unifying tower form, the Board recommended developing the rooftop elements in a way that is sculptural and cohesive. The Board also referenced the 1201 2nd Avenue (project #3019177) as an example. (A2, B1, B3, B4)"*

It's difficult to determine the success of the roof top elements with elevations. Provide perspectives with more detail. After I've received these graphics, I may have additional feedback. Also estimate to the best of your ability at this time the extent of mechanical needs and show in the MUP plan set.

13. Streetscape: Coordinate with SDOT for approval of all planting in the ROW. Please confer with Ben Roberts, City Arborist and forward on correspondence.

14. Signage. Please add the following note to all elevations: *"All signs require a separate review and permit per SMC 23.55. Design Review approval does not supersede the Sign Code or review."*

15. Design Review Recommendation Packet: The SDCI website includes a design recommendation packet checklist <http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/permits/permittypes/designreviewfull/default.htm> - go to "Steps to get Your Permit/#4 Design Recommendation" sections and click on "Recommendation Packet Checklist") that explains in detail the items that should be included in the draft design packet. I generally utilize this checklist to verify completeness of the DR Recommendation packet.

In addition to the information identified on the SDCI draft design recommendation packet checklist, include the specific information requested by the Board in the EDG report.

State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

Corrections

16. SEPA Checklist: Our environmental review process has recently been updated and we no longer accept an intent of EIS addendum. Submit the form, Environmental (SEPA) Checklist, updated in 2016, per this link: <http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/permits/forms/default.htm>

After SDCI receives and reviews the information, we will determine if there are significant impacts and the appropriate review method.